

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-5 and 7-21 are now present in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 6 has been incorporated into claim 1 and hereby cancelled. Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 13-20 are allowed and claims 6-11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant greatly appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the present amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable dependent claim 6, as discussed hereinbelow.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. Accordingly, all pending claims are now definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1, 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) [sic., § 102(e)] as being anticipated by Yoshli, U.S. Patent No. 7,321,407. Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshli in view of Sasagawa, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0035927. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As mentioned, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 6, which was indicated by the Examiner as including allowable subject matter. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 1 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.


It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Cheng-Kang (Greg) Hsu, Registration No. 61,007 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  #61007
Paul C. Lewis
Registration No.: 43,368
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant